

DRINKING WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND (DWSRF) LOAN PROGRAM – SFY 2004

Effective July 1, 2003 - June 30, 2004

Third Quarter UPDATE 1/1/04

7/1/03

Costs in (\$1,000)

Project Categories

PPL Rank/Project Name	Total Score/ Project Need	Population Served	PWS ID#/ LOAN NO.	A	B	C	D	E	F	MHI (Real \$\$)	Estimated Const. \$\$	Planning/ Design \$\$	Total Project	Cumulative Total
1 MARSHALL	175 PH,C,I	379	5261003 DW101173 01			X	X		X	\$33,906	\$1,761	\$410	\$2,171	\$2,171
2 EAST CHICAGO (2nd)	120 PH,I	33892	5245012 DW199110 02	X		X			X	\$26,538	?	?	\$14,100	\$16,271
3 BEVERLY SHORES	100 PH,I	622	N/A DW101196 01		X		X		X	\$59,107	\$4,883	\$795	\$5,678	\$21,949
4 WHITING	100 PH,I	5137	5245048 DW103228 01	X	X					\$34,972	\$3,750	\$425	\$4,175	\$26,124
5 BLOOMINGTON #2	90 I	100000	5253002 DW103221 01	X	X	X				\$25,377	\$6,600	\$1,685	\$8,285	\$34,409
6 WINAMAC	85 PH,I	2262	5266005 DW101197 01	X	X	X			X	\$31,413	\$2,166	\$194	\$2,360	\$36,769
7 ROCKVILLE	85 I	2706	5261006 DW101185 01	X		X			X	\$27,813	\$2,236	\$462	\$2,698	\$39,467
8 ODON	80 PH,I	1475	5214005 DW103230 01	X	X				X	\$34,667	\$607	\$234	\$841	\$40,308
9 SYRACUSE	80 PH,I	3038	5243025 DW104232 01	X		X			X	\$40,000	\$5,671	\$1,419	\$7,090	\$47,398
10 CLINTON (CITY OF)	75 I	5040	5283004 DW101183 01		X	X				\$29,330	\$1,399	\$257	\$1,656	\$49,054
11 SHARPSVILLE	70 PH,I	618	3280003 DW102214 01		X	X			X	\$52,292	\$975	\$244	\$1,219	\$50,273
12 GREENTOWN	70 I	2546	5234006 DW102218 01	X	X	X				\$43,750	\$1,625	\$225	\$1,850	\$52,123
13 PATRIOT	70 I	7150	5278001 DW102219 01	X	X	X			X	\$37,500	\$2,400	\$725	\$3,125	\$55,248
14 DALEVILLE	65 PH,I	1658	5218027 DW103225 01	X					X	\$40,592	\$515	\$35	\$550	\$55,798
15 CHURUBUSCO	65 PH,I	1660	5292003 DW101193 01	X		X				\$39,583	\$1,443	\$317	\$1,760	\$57,558
16 RUSSIAVILLE	65 I	988	5234008 DW103223 01		X	X			X	\$40,875	\$1,293	\$263	\$1,556	\$59,114
17 AND TRO, INC.	60 I	250	5262001 DW100169 01		X					\$36,246	\$929	\$192	\$1,121	\$60,235
18 REELSVILLE	60 I	1950	5267006 DW100166 01		X	X	X		X	\$43,867	\$4,625	\$475	\$5,100	\$65,335
19 JONESBORO	60 I	2300	5227010 DW102217 01		X	X				\$36,974	\$195	\$630	\$825	\$66,160
20 CLINTON TOWNSHIP	60 I	2900	5283003 DW100150 01	X	X	X			X	\$32,826	\$2,291	\$627	\$2,918	\$69,078

	<u>PPL Rank/Project Name</u>	<u>Total Score/ Project Need</u>	<u>Population Served</u>	<u>PWS ID#/ LOAN NO.</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>MHI (Real \$\$)</u>	<u>Estimated Const. \$\$</u>	<u>Planning/ Design \$\$</u>	<u>Total Project</u>	<u>Cumulative Total</u>
21	MARTINSVILLE	60 I	11698	5255009 DW102221 01		X	X				\$32,746	\$3,500	\$275	\$3,775	\$72,853
22	WOLCOTTVILLE	55 I	877	5244010 DW101199 01	X	X				X	\$35,833	\$679	\$65	\$744	\$73,597
23	DALE	55 I	1553	5274002 DW102202 01		X	X				\$36,295	\$883	\$237	\$1,120	\$74,717
24	WALDRON CD	50 I	800	5273006 DW103226 01		X	X				\$41,375	\$380	\$70	\$450	\$75,167
25	WALTON	50 I	1069	5209010 DW103227 01	X	X	X				\$41,429	\$1,400	\$170	\$1,570	\$76,737
26	SPICELAND	45 I	867	5233016 DW101189 01	X	X	X			X	\$45,875	\$2,000	\$275	\$2,275	\$79,012
27	DANVILLE	45 PH,I	6418	5232004 DW103231 01	X						\$54,330	\$1,720	\$240	\$1,960	\$80,972
28	VALLEY VIEW EST.	40 I	300	5235014 DW102207 01		X		X			\$35,600	\$185	\$25	\$210	\$81,182
29	LAGRO	40 I	496	5285005 DW102212 01						X	\$34,327	\$517	\$200	\$717	\$81,899
30	PITTSBORO	25 I	1588	5232019 DW102203 01		X		X			\$47,740	\$332	\$50	\$382	\$82,281

Italics = Population <10,000
Lower Case = Have opted out
Bold = applied for SRF before March 7, 2003
highlighted = closed

Project Need

PH = Public Health, MCL Violation
C = Compliance with SDWA
I = Infrastructure type project

A = Treatment Plant Installation
or Upgrade of Existing System
B = Transmission/Distribution
Line Project
C = Water Storage Project
D = Physical Consolidation Project
E = System Restructuring/Capacity Development
F = Other
MHI = Median Household Income

If two or more projects score equally
under the Project Scoring and Ranking
System, the project with the highest
points in the Public Health Section will
prevail. If a tie persists, then the project
that serves the smallest population
will prevail.

Notes:

*Russiaville's PER says total project cost is \$1,556,300, but planning on DOC funding \$480,000, which would make SRF loan total \$813,600.
Lagro's PER says total project cost is \$716,908, but planning on DOC funding \$495,000, so SRF would fund \$221,908.*

<u>PPL Rank/Project Name</u>	<u>Total Score/ Project Need</u>	<u>Population Served</u>	<u>PWS ID#/ LOAN NO.</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>MHI (Real \$)</u>	<u>Estimated Const. \$</u>	<u>Planning/ Design \$</u>	<u>Total Project</u>	<u>Cumulative Total</u>
------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	--------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------

Projects who dropped off of the PPL during SFY 2004

[illegible]